CAPA Workshop
8th December 2010

In attendance: Christine Bunting, Christy Caldwell, Greg Careaga (CAPA chair), Elizabeth Cowell, Frank Gravier, Ann Hubble, Lee Jaffe, Nicole Lawson, Ken Lyons (CAPA vice-chair, recording), Annette Marines, Kate McGirr, Nicholas Meriwether, Karen Mokrzycki, Cynthia Moriconi, Sue Perry, Beth Remak, Kerry Scott, Ginny Steel

A handout was distributed listing Web links relevant to the review procedure and accompanying documentation, along with descriptions and notes on the latter.

The handout was put into context: documents relevant to librarian reviews—APM, MOU, PAPA, LAUC position papers—are scattered in various places on-line and the purpose of the handout is to collect them in one place. This document will also be posted on the LAUC-SC page.

The stated purpose of the workshop: Go over the librarian review procedure to reduce angst and offer advice.

Review of documentation

1. Biography for Academic Personnel form: Mostly static, this document contains basic information about the candidate; candidates should be sure to update contact information.

2. Biography Supplement: Also known as the Bio-Bib(liography), this helps CAPA get an overview of a candidate’s arc of experience during the review period and sets out activities criterion-by-criterion; candidates are not expected to have contributions in every area, although advancement in rank and step should be accompanied by increasing responsibility and leadership.

   Suggestions: To reduce the stress of compiling two or three years’ activities, set aside time monthly throughout the review period to add the previous month’s work; use and stick to the order of review criteria as laid out in Documentation Guidelines for the Review of Librarians/LAUC Position Paper №3 (http://www.ucop.edu/lauc/about/paper03.html).

3. Self-Evaluation: The most substantial document of the review process; though optional, it is a candidate’s opportunity to describe and place into context the noteworthiness of one’s activities over the review period; it is not necessary for ‘normal’ (i.e. non-promotion, non-career-, non-distinguished status) reviews to be comprehensive about activities throughout one’s entire career.

   General guidelines for the self-evaluation:

   It should be ‘succinct, well-organised, and easy-to-read’

   Although the annual goals document is not officially part of the review packet or procedure, it may be helpful to cite these goals in the self-evaluation

   It should focus on major accomplishments of the review period and the impact of these on the Library, campus, University, and one’s own career

   It should be frank about projects that didn’t turn out as planned—and what was learned from them—as well as accomplishments
It should focus on the impact one's contributions have had with respect to the Library's strategic initiatives and goals (CAPA will be looking at these as well).

It should put the candidate's committee participation in context by describing one's contributions and their impact on the Library or the profession.

Materials supplemental to the packet (e.g. copies of reports, course guides, samples of creative work &c.) can be useful, but be judicious with volume.

Review-procedure timeline

- The process began in October. Each librarian has received notice of her or his review status for this year. Each candidate should have already met with her or his review initiator (RI).

- If a librarian wishes to be considered for review this year ahead of schedule or if a candidate for review this year has cause to request a deferral, she or he should consult with her or his RI immediately.

- On return from winter break, candidates submit a draft of the review to the RI. The RI provides feedback and may request names of confidential referees from candidates.

- By the end of January, candidates submit their review packets in their final form to their RIs.

- In March, the RI completes an evaluation of the candidate. The candidate signs off on the RI’s evaluation and has the opportunity to respond to it in writing.

- The review packet is forwarded to CAPA for consideration.

- CAPA forwards the packet, along with its recommendation, to the Deciding Officer (usually the University Librarian).

- The Deciding Officer notifies the candidate of her decision.

Questions and discussion

Question: Is it necessary for soon-to-be-retired librarians to go through the review procedure?
Answer: KMcG stated if librarian will be retiring within the review period, a letter stating the prospective date of retirement should be submitted to the University Librarian. The UL will accept the candidate letter and excuse her or him from the review process.

Question: Does the comment earlier in this session concerning being judicious with supplemental documents in packet mean they should be dispensed with?
Answer: It’s better to submit a smaller number of such documents, providing context for them in one’s self-evaluation, than a comprehensive binder-full of non-contextual exhibits [discussion ensued of the value and use of supplemental documents]

Discussion: The difficulty of defining some librarian duties (e.g. Access, Digital Initiatives, Instruction) in terms of the five categories listed as ‘major areas of librarianship’ in the Biography Supplement

GC:
- The A(cademic) P(ersonnel) M(annual) is not meant to be restrictive to candidates’ ability to include what is appropriate

GS:
- It is important to talk with one’s RI about the plan-of-action for review—communication is crucial.
• On return of the draft packet from one’s RI, a second consultation should take place between the candidate and RI—the point being to gain input on how well one has done over the review period and the importance of actions in light of organisational goals
• Look at the criteria based on where one is in rank/step and discuss with the RI
• Neither the UL nor CAPA have any set ‘formula’ of activities and responsibilities—these depend on the individual librarian’s circumstances
• The UL recognises low staffing levels will result in more concentration on Criterion 1/primary duties, but candidates at associate and librarian ranks will want to be able to include at least some activities under Criteria 2, 3, and 4; and for those in the librarian rank, any positions of leadership are especially important to include